

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for his thorough examination and for granting the Applicant a telephonic interview on April 13, 2005. During the telephonic interview, several patentable distinctions between the claimed invention and Agesen et al. were discussed. For the Examiner's convenience, these distinctions are summarized below. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits the claims as originally filed are patentable over Agesen et al. for the reasons discussed below.

Nevertheless, per the agreement reached with the Examiner, independent claim 28 has been amended to additionally recite the features recited in claims 29, 30 and 31. Other independent claims have been amended in a similar manner, and the new claims 41-46 recite similar features as those which the Examiner has found to be patentable over Agesen et al. Accordingly, it is respectfully that the all pending claims are in condition for early allowance. However, the Applicant reserves the right to pursue claims of the original scope in a continuation as this claim amendment has been amended solely in order to expedite prosecution.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 22-40 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by "An efficient Meta-Lock for Implementing Ubiquitous Synchronization, Oct. 1999, Sun Microsystems Laboratories" (Agesen et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed below for at least the following reasons:

(a) Agesen et al. does NOT teach a substantially direct reference from a thread to a monitor (claim 28)

It is noted that Agesen et al. states that when a state associated with an object can be "locked," one of the lock-records belongs to a thread that holds the monitor-lock (Agesen et al., Fig. 3, page 211, left column, 2nd paragraph). However, it is respectfully submitted that Agesen et al. does NOT teach a substantially direct reference from a thread to a monitor. Instead, Agesen et al. describes the relationship between an object and a lock-record which represents a thread for the purposes of synchronization on a particular object (Please see, Fig. 3 of Agesen et al.).

(b) Agesen et al. does NOT teach identifying, using and updating the contents of a reference field associated with a thread when performing a memory reclamation during a wait state initiated by a wait action as a result of invoking an object using the thread (claim 28)

It is noted that *Agesen et al.* states: when a thread acquires a monitor-lock, it moves its lock-record to the front so that the first lock-record of the locked object always belongs to the thread that holds the monitor lock (*Agesen et al.*, page 211, left column, last four lines). However, it is respectfully submitted moving a lock-record to the front does NOT teach or suggest: identifying, using, or updating the contents of a reference field associated with a thread. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that *Agesen et al.* does NOT teach or even remotely suggest performing these operations when performing a memory reclamation during a wait state.

(c) Agesen et al. does NOT teach reclaiming a monitor because the contents of a monitor field associated with the monitor indicates that the monitor is in use (claim 32)

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion (Office Action, page 7), it is respectfully submitted that moving a lock-record to the front does NOT teach the additional features recited in claim 32. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 32 is patentable over *Agesen et al.* for yet additional reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that all the pending claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. SUN1P280). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



R. Mahboubian

Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300